

A regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Tuesday, March 8, 2016, at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

President Brian S. McCarthy presided; City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch recorded.

Prayer was offered by City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch; Alderman Sean M. McGuinness led in the Pledge to the Flag.

The roll call was taken with 14 members of the Board of Aldermen present; Alderman Tom Lopez was not in attendance but participated in the meeting via telecommunication.

Mayor James W. Donchess was also present; Corporation Counsel Steven A. Bolton joined the meeting after being sworn into office.

President McCarthy acknowledged Alderman Lopez was participating by telephone and under the terms of the state law that allows him to participate, Alderman Lopez stated he was in Honduras, that he was alone and that he could hear the proceedings. President McCarthy acknowledged he could hear Alderman Lopez and asked Vice President Wilshire to make a motion to accept procedural actions without objection.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN WILSHIRE THAT THE RULES BE SO FAR SUSPENDED AS TO ALLOW FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF PROCEDURAL ACTIONS WITHOUT OBJECTION**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| Yea: | Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane,<br>Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron,<br>Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja,<br>Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty,<br>Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy | 15 |
|------|---|----|

|      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| Nay: |  | 0 |
|------|--|---|

**MOTION CARRIED**

REMARKS BY THE MAYOR

Mayor Donchess

First on tonight's agenda are two appointments; one is Steve Bolton for the position of City Attorney. Attorney Bolton has served as City Attorney before. In fact when I was Mayor the first time around he was the City Attorney for a number of those years and he always did a really good job. He is an expert in municipal law and a graduate of Dartmouth College and New England Law School. I am confident that he will do a good job for the city and I've told him that one of his principle responsibilities is to respond to inquiries and requests by the Board of Aldermen and to provide even-handed legal advice to us as a city based upon the law of any question that comes so I would ask for your votes to confirm Steve Bolton as the City Attorney.

The other appointment is Bobbie Bagley for the position of Director of Public Health and Community Services. Bobbie is extremely qualified in the area of public health. She has a Master's Degree in Public Health in addition to a Bachelor's Degree. She's pursuing a doctorate in public health policy from the University of Illinois at Chicago; this is an on-line course. She has previously been a public health nurse for the City of Nashua, she's been the Director of the Public Health for the City of Nashua and she has most recently been running the Master's in Nursing Program at Rivier College and of course has been a professor there and has been teaching at Rivier for the last few years. She came on as an interim acting capacity a couple of weeks ago and since that time she has been leading the Mayor's Opioid Task Force

and that's one of the reasons that I appointed her because she highly qualified to help us respond to the problem of heroin and substance abuse in the city. We held the second meeting of the task force earlier this week and I think we have made a good start with her help in assembling people from industry and the people that are involved with the problem; Harbor Homes, the hospitals and many other people in terms of prevention, treatment and recovery. We are trying to develop objective criteria as to how to measure whether we are improving our response and also fill gaps in service where we know they exist such as in the area of recovery services for those who have been treated but need support for a couple of years after their treatment program. I am going to ask that you also support Bobbi Bagley for the position of Director of Public Health and Community Services.

I also wanted to mention that our representatives on the House Public Works Committee, the Governor's 10-year highway plan proposes a \$4 million allocation for the completion of all of the work that is necessary to prepare for a federal application to seek a rail subsidy in order to pursue the rail to Manchester. That's \$3.2 million of federal money which is very specifically purposed to projects like this and \$800,000 of toll credits. Those toll credits are simply credits and not real state money so this particular step does not cost the state any money, despite that there is some opposition in the legislature. So on that committee we have Marty Jack from Ward 9 and Carl Siedel from Ward 1 and they both did an extremely good job of that committee where they were able to defeat an amendment to remove the \$4 million from the Governor's 10-year plan and it now goes on to the House floor and hopefully no changes will be made by the House but that vote is expected to take place Wednesday or Thursday.

Burke Street; our project continues. Alderman Deane and the others that are helping to make recommendations regarding that project have interviewed and made an initial selection regarding an architect. This will come before us later on and I think they are now discussing and negotiating with the architect in order to try to get the best deal we can in terms of the architectural services for that big project.

Another thing I wanted to mention regarding Burke Street is that there is this 50,000 square foot office building there and that's one of the main purposes for which we made the decision to buy the building. Bobbi Bagley and the other department heads from the Public Health and Community Services made a visit over there to see if they would be interested in the extra space. The plan has been that public works would be relocated over there and take approximately ½ of the space and our public health people went over to see what they thought of the space and they were very enthusiastic about it which surprised me because I thought the distance from the downtown would be an issue. They have talked with the transit people and there is a bus stop nearby and that can be adjusted a little bit to make it very possible for people who want to use their services or need their services to go by bus. Anybody who is working with welfare or with public health can get a free bus pass. This isn't set in stone and it would come before you but I thought it was interesting that after we have been searching for an alternative for that division for a long time in terms of additional space that it at least might be possible that Burke Street would work out.

RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF THE MAYOR - None

RECOGNITION PERIOD – None

READING MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

***There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the minutes of the Board of Aldermen meeting of February 23, 2016, accepted, placed on file and the reading suspended.***

COMMUNICATIONS

***There being no objection, President McCarthy declared that all communications be read by title only.***

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract Award for 2016 Paving Program

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN COOKSON TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE CONTRACT TO BROX INDUSTRIES, INC., IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,627,902**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, 15  
Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron,  
Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja,  
Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty,  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract Award for Biosolids Disposal

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SIEGEL TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE MULTI-YEAR CONTRACT TO CASELLA ORGANICS FOR A THREE-YEAR TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$1,215,000**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, 15  
Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron,  
Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja,  
Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty,  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Brian S. McCarthy, President, Board of Aldermen  
Re: Resolution R-16-007, Relative to the Acceptance and Appropriation of \$40,000  
From the State of New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services  
into Public Health and Community Services Grant Activity "FY2016 and FY2017  
Climate and Health Adaptation Plan (CHAP)"

***There being no objection, President McCarthy accepted the communication and placed it on file***

PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT RELATIVE TO ITEMS EXPECTED TO BE ACTED  
UPON THIS EVENING – None

PETITIONS – None

NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS – None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Committee on Infrastructure ..... 02/24/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 24, 2016 Committee on Infrastructure accepted and placed on file.

Human Affairs Committee Site Visits ..... 02/29/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the February 29, 2016 Human Affairs Committee Site Visits accepted and placed on file.

Planning & Economic Development Committee ..... 03/01/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the March 1, 2016 Planning & Economic Development Committee accepted and placed on file.

Finance Committee ..... 03/02/16

There being no objection, President McCarthy declared the report of the March 2, 2016 Finance Committee accepted and placed on file.

There being no objection, President McCarthy suspended the rules as to allow for the oral report of the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee meeting held last evening regarding the appointment of Steven A. Bolton to the Office of City Solicitor and the appointment of Bobbie Bagley to the Officer of Director of Public Health

*Alderman Clemons gave an oral report regarding the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee recommendation on the above-referenced Appointments by the Mayor.*

Alderman Cookson

Is there no substance to the report?

President McCarthy

You have just heard it.

Alderman Cookson

That's unfortunate; thank you, Mr. President.

There being no objection, President McCarthy accepted and placed on file the oral report as presented.

WRITTEN REPORTS FROM LIAISONS - None

CONFIRMATION OF MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS

City Solicitor

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN WILSHIRE TO CONFIRM BY VOICE VOTE THE APPOINTMENT OF STEVEN A. BOLTON, 4 KYLE DRIVE, NASHUA, TO THE OFFICE OF CITY SOLICITOR FOR AN INDEFINITE TERM AT THE PLEASURE OF THE MAYOR**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Siegel

I did not discuss this at Personnel last night, that was enough of a zoo but my opinion on this is that I appreciate Attorney Bolton's skill as an attorney. My concern is that the job is more than just City Attorney, it's also a manager of employees; in particular some valuable employees, Celia Leonard and Dory Clarke who I know we all love. I also want to make sure that one of the things that distinguished Attorney Bennett, and he's not with us so I am not lobbying for his return or anything, was his ability to separate out; we would go head to head pretty hard but that never really entered into anything else. There was always a separation there and legislation got through. I'm just a little concerned that I wouldn't see the same thing. I am particularly concerned that as a manager of our employees of the legal department; I would just like to believe that everything would be okay but my only experience is what I have seen in the public forum which is this Chamber so that's my concern. Again, I am not taking away from Attorney Bolton as an attorney, he's demonstrated that he is more than capable, that's not the issue and that's all I have to say.

Alderman McGuinness

I did not attend the meeting last night but I will say that I listened to some of the media on the website and with respect to Alderman Schoneman's question to Attorney Bolton, I thought his answers were well thought out and I believe everything he says and I will endorse this nomination.

Alderman Schoneman

I was at the meeting last night and I asked the question and the answer was a good one. Nevertheless, I am still thinking as we go around here for this vote what would be the best thing to do. I take representation seriously and I've heard from a number of folks in Ward 3 who are not in favor of this appointment. Nevertheless, I do also recognize that Mr. Bolton is qualified to do the work. It's a difficult question but I weigh constituent needs and feelings heavily but in spite of that I did respect his answer and I respect him as an attorney.

Alderman LeBrun

To the Board, I have spoken to quite a few individuals that I keep in the highest regard about this nomination. They are people who have been in city government in the past that know the attorney very well and for that very reason, based on what they have told me about him, I will be voting for this nomination.

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| Yea: | Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Cookson,<br>Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Schoneman,<br>Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,<br>Alderman Moriarty, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez,<br>Alderman McCarthy | 13 |
|------|--|----|

|      |                                 |   |
|------|---------------------------------|---|
| Nay: | Alderman Deane, Alderman Siegel | 2 |
|------|---------------------------------|---|

**MOTION CARRIED**

President McCarthy declared Steven A. Bolton duly appointed to the Office of City Solicitor for an indefinite term at the pleasure of the Mayor.

Oath of Office administered by City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch.

Director of Public Health

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO CONFIRM BY VOICE VOTE THE APPOINTMENT OF BOBBIE BAGLEY, 17 BUNKER HILL DRIVE, LONDONDERRY, TO THE OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH FOR AN INDEFINITE TERM AT THE PLEASURE OF THE MAYOR**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Cookson, 14  
Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel,  
Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman McGuinness,  
Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty, Alderman O'Brien,  
Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: Alderman Deane 1

**MOTION CARRIED**

President McCarthy declared Bobbie Bagley duly appointed to the Office of Director of Public Health for an indefinite term at the pleasure of the Mayor.

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS THAT THE RULES BE SO FAR SUSPENDED AS TO ALLOW FOR A MOTION TO RECONSIDER R-16-007 BY A PERSON NOT ON THE PREVAILING SIDE**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, 8  
Alderman Caron, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman O'Brien,  
Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Siegel, 7  
Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,  
Alderman Moriarty

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO RECONSIDER R-16-007**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Deane

I would appreciate being called on when my hand goes up. At the last meeting you didn't call upon me until after the vote was taken.

President McCarthy

I don't recall that.

President Deane

It is my understanding that it takes ten votes to suspend, does it not?

President McCarthy

No, we have an ordinance that says that however we cannot by ordinance defeat the rules of the majority, the will of the majority of the Board as set forth in the Charter. If you like I will ask the City Attorney to comment on that.

Alderman Deane

That's quite alright.

Alderman Moriarty

I would like clarification on that. I may be wrong but I am led to believe that if you have a super majority to make that ordinance then it would take a super majority to undo that ordinance and override it.

President McCarthy

Only where the Charter requires a super majority is a super majority required.

Alderman Moriarty

What is R-16-007?

President McCarthy

Relative to the acceptance and appropriation of \$40,000 from the State of New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services into Public Health and Community Services Grant Activity FY 2016 and FY 2017; Climate and Health Acceptance Plan (CHAP)

Alderman Siegel

So here we are again with the exact same legislation, nothing has changed and now it's being reconsidered and the reason why it's being reconsidered is well, I guess the Board didn't do their homework. When I was objecting to this the reason it wasn't tabled is because I knew exactly what I was voting against, I made the case against this. Last evening, during Bobbi Bagley's confirmation hearing I asked Ms. Bagley what her top three priorities were for the Department of Health and not one of them came close to being in the universe of this grant. I also asked if somehow she felt we had all of the resources that we needed to accomplish what the health department needs to accomplish and remember that we have an opioid crisis here and I obviously think that's a high priority and there are grants that are being considered for a first reading tonight which clearly fall into the purview of the Board of Health. This is speculative and it's not the highest priority. I made that argument before so even the sponsor of the legislation didn't know what they were sponsoring; the Alderman that was the liaison to the Board of Health couldn't provide any light in addition to what was there. Again, I read the legislation, I knew what this was and I will insist that nothing has changed, if anything a clarification that we received, if you want to call it that, makes it even more clear to me that this is not a priority for this Board. The argument was made that

if don't take this money then someone else will. That's like walking down the street and seeing a wallet on the street and saying you know what, if I don't take the money out of that wallet someone else will. Everybody wants to complain about government waste but what they are really saying effectively is everyone is wasting but we get to do what we want. To me waste is when you are taking money to perform a service or try to do a project which takes city resources that are scarce to begin with and redirect them into an area which is not one of the highest priorities. If this were to take no resources; let's assume that nobody interacts with this grant at all, that would mean that nobody is providing any input to guide the city so how does this help Nashua or the regional plan? Or, when this finally gets done, we will stick it on the shelf and not react to it at all because that's the only way it would take no resources so if it would take no input and provide no viable output then it's not really useful unless we believe that we have an excess of capacity in our health department to address at best is not in our top ten of things that we need to worry about. There are plenty of things that we do need to worry about and if this were directed towards that, for example, any of the latest viruses that we are seeing spreading worldwide, okay but that's not what this is about. I can't see that anything has changed other than hey, you know what; we didn't have the opportunity to come into the Chamber fully prepared to vote on this so let's get a free pass. The legislation hasn't changed and the reasons to vote against it haven't changed. Everyone wants forgiveness for being unprepared. I hope this is a lesson to everyone who wants to sponsor legislation to at least read the legislation and understand what you are voting on or what you are sponsoring so when it comes time to discuss it if need be, you understand what it was that you put your name to.

Alderman Clemons

There are three things that have changed. At the prior meeting, Mayor Donchess, who is the primary sponsor of this legislation, was not present and neither were two of the co-sponsors, Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire and Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja. I attempted to make a motion to table so that when they were present and they could explain perhaps why this was important they would be here and at least have the opportunity to vote on it. It's consideration that was not given to them and it's a shame that we treat our colleagues like that when we see an opportunity that maybe we can count numbers, count our hands.

Alderman Siegel

Point of order, Mr. President, that's describing a motive to what I was doing and I resent that because that's not it.

Alderman Clemons

I think the appropriate thing to do is to allow for the entire Board of Aldermen to vote on this particularly when the sponsors of the legislation were not present to defend it.

Alderman Schoneman

I just wanted to point out that some of the sponsors of the legislation were here. Furthermore, those that did vote on it; did not know either so it's not just that two or three of the sponsors weren't here but the sponsors who were here and everyone else who voted on it didn't have an answer. I think that says that it's simply superfluous and it was viewed as free money and we simply cannot go down that road anymore.

Alderman Wilshire

I resent the fact that this is superfluous. The Public Health Department would not have applied for this grant if they felt it was superfluous. You got the information, you know what the outcomes are and you know what they are looking at the grant for and I think tabling it would have been the respectful thing to do so I am hoping this bill gets support this evening. I think they went to all of the trouble to get this grant and



they were awarded the grant. It may not be the top three priorities but it is something that they will continue to work on. I urge you to support this.

Alderman Siegel

Well, I'll tell you that we set a very bad precedent by constantly having the Michael Jackson Zombie legislation maneuver. I'm sorry that in the previous term that Alderman Soucy came up with that because it looks like this is going to be the new world order where we just resurrect legislation willy-nilly. I'd like to at least for my colleagues sake, at least have an agreement, this happened this time but I would like hopefully that this is not we are going to be doing business in the future. Obviously we can if we decide but the same people that were so against this when that came up in the November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of last term seem to have been okay with it now so that's a little bit of a problem. The second thing is that I don't agree with my colleague, respectfully, Alderman Wilshire, that this was something that we necessarily have to agree with because a lot of work was put into the grant. I won't argue that work was put into the grant but there is a sum cost for things and just because there is a sum cost doesn't make the decision something that we do, that's why we vote on things. There are things that we turn down as Aldermen that there is work that's done and we okay. We see it but we decide we are not going to go with it, we may decide otherwise on this. Work is always put in, anything that comes before this Board work is put in. Let me read the sentence here "Purpose of Grant Initiative, to develop a climate and health adaptation plan for the Greater Nashua Public Health Region and implement an evidence based (as opposed to nonsense based, I suppose) intervention to address a top priority health impact burden related to weather climate vulnerability aimed at improving public health at the population level." Where does that fit into the priorities of this city, assuming you can even parse that sentence? This is the objection that I have. It doesn't matter that the money is available; at some point I think it behooves us as public servants to say okay, I understand the money is out there but that doesn't necessarily always mean that we grab it. That's what I argued before and that's what I argue now. It wasn't about vote counting, I didn't count votes, I didn't lobby anybody; everybody voted independently on their own. I would have made the exact same statement had all 15 members of the Board been here.

Alderman O'Brien

In looking at this I hear my colleague, Alderman Siegel, but if I could bring a little something, I've been a State Representative for approximately ten years and as many times issues come up to the House and I've seen people within our Chamber say that a certain person couldn't be there that night and that particular bill gets moved off the table. The main important thing is our job and the reason it's done that something that is brought up in legislation before us can be properly vetted. If the person that is here with the most amount of information, I wasn't 100% sure of this myself but the person who was here that probably could have supplied me with that information wasn't. Out of respect we should have moved to table but this Board chose not to table and that to me, more than any other point that was brought up, is the most dangerous. We should have the respect as Board, if a member is not here and cannot discuss the issue before us; what was the rush? Why couldn't we have tabled it and then we could have vetted it? I hope that we now have the proper information to make a wise decision on this bill. You can say the merits of climate change, I don't know, maybe the world is getting hotter or maybe it's getting colder but evidently somebody felt it was important to get a grant. Coming from my previous employment, to write a grant is a lot of work so somebody really felt that this had merit and spent a lot of man hours on it and has brought it to us and we should take the time and properly vet this and make the right decision.

Alderman Moriarty

I just wanted to bring down this discussion for a minute with regard to Mason's Rules. Regarding Alderman Siegel's point of order, it wasn't a point of order it was a personal privilege. Just for anyone who is new, when you call a point of order what you are saying is that you recognize that a procedural rule has been violated. Alderman Clemons, by offending Alderman Siegel, was not a violation of a procedure but an

offense and Alderman Siegel has every right to raise his hand and call personal privilege and call him out on that. Unfortunately, I begrudgingly accept the ruling on the fact that we have required ten votes to suspend the rules can be undone by only eight votes. In Mason's Rules it says that a majority does not have the power to make a rule that cannot be modified or repealed by a majority so if a majority makes a rule that says a super majority has to do something then that same majority can undo that rule that makes a super majority. Of course we didn't follow that procedure, we just ignored it and actually that would have been a point of order. My question is Mason's talks in terms of rules; it doesn't talk in terms of ordinances so the fact that the Board made an ordinance that requires ten votes to suspend the rules makes me think that what we really need to do is submit an ordinance to undo that ordinance. Just like you may rule that we can't do that because the Constitution says we can't and just like in the United States if you pass a law that's unconstitutional it's still in effect until someone challenges it in court. So, in some sense I believe that ordinance is still in effect until somebody actually legally challenges it. I'll finish by asking our new, esteemed Corporate Counsel if you can please research this and tell us if there is a difference between Mason's Rules and how it defines a rule versus an ordinance. If the ordinance is in effect is it still in effect until it's legally challenged even though it might be unconstitutional and finally, what is it going to take for us to change the Constitution so that it takes ten votes to suspend the rules because it's ridiculous...there's a reason we have rules and just to be able to throw them out the window with a majority I think is absurd so I am all for a Constitutional amendment and put it on the Charter vote and put it on a ballot and have the people of Nashua make it so it requires ten votes. That's the question that I have.

President McCarthy

Alderman Moriarty, would you please turn to rule #1 and read it to the Board?

Alderman Moriarty

Sure. It is necessary that every deliberative body be governed by rules of procedure in order that the will of the majority of its members may be determined and revealed in an orderly manner. Right, so the majority can decide to do whatever the heck it wants. I agree with that and that's why I am thinking what we really need is a change in the city Charter that says to suspend the rules takes ten votes. Thank you for all of your patience.

President McCarthy

Attorney Bolton, would you like to answer?

Attorney Bolton

I'd be happy to research this further because what I say just off hand may not be the last word on the subject. It strikes me that my recollection is that there is an enactment somewhere in the city Charter that provides that the Board of Aldermen will adopt by ordinance rules of procedure so I would say this is both an ordinance and a rule of procedure. Just as a side, that provision exempts those rules of procedure from the otherwise veto power of the Mayor because they are to govern the Boards own procedure. Basically I guess it's recognition that the Mayor has no role in telling the Board how to conduct its business. While it is certainly possible to by ordinance repeal that existing requirement, the existing wording, that would lead to tend to indicate that there is a requirement of a ten vote super majority to suspend the rules, I tend to agree with the President that that was not a proper rule when passed and therefore, this Board does not run afoul of anyone else by not following it. If the desire is to absolutely repeal it and avoid confusion then our office would be pleased to prepare that for anyone who wishes and if you want a more detailed answer I would be happy to provide a written opinion after a little more research but off the top of my head that is my understanding.

Alderman Siegel

Regarding the vetting process, I would point out that the person most appropriate to vet in a sense was Alderman Lopez who is our health department liaison who was at the meetings I presume when this was discussed. I would also point out that if one looks at the Human Affairs Committee meeting where this was discussed at the committee level where everyone was present and it was supposedly vetted the meeting minutes indicate that there was no discussion whatsoever so the opportunities to vet it at that level didn't occur for one reason or another. The appropriate parties were present and there was an ability to vet but I guess that just didn't happen in my opinion.

Alderman Lopez

Alderman Siegel is 100% correct. I probably should have vetted it when it came across at the initial meeting. The discussion at the Board of Health meeting was to simply announce that the grant was at the Board of Aldermen and there wasn't more detail, to my knowledge, given about the substance of it. In the last Board of Aldermen meeting, Alderman Siegel had already described the grant in a tangential way but it is essence he was correct in how he described it and the concern that he raised about not knowing the specifics, I agreed with at the time because I had not had any specific details about the \$40,000 we were accepting. Since then I have reached out to the Board of Health Chair and he has provided more information and a much more detailed copy of the grant. He also forwarded it to the Board of Aldermen. It is in my opinion something that is useful. I did listen to the minutes of yesterdays' Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee meeting and I think what Bobbi Bagley was speaking of when she said that there's a great need; when Alderman Siegel has asked if the health department has all of the resources it needed she mentioned specifically need for capacity and need for partners so while a focused approach on substance abuse and recovery and the opioid problem at a detox level might only focus on the people who are addicted. A public health model would actually include multiple stakeholders and community partners. The kind of research that you would do to study climate change can also be used as an education tool to engage people in discussing what the Public Health Department does. It could build more partnerships and resources for the Public Health Department so having that information I am much more in favor of it now than I was at the previous meeting. I would like to apologize to the Board for not making that information available at the beginning. As Alderman Siegel said, it was a teaching moment and I am listening.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Unfortunately I was not here two weeks ago when this came up but it has always been my understanding that the purpose of this grant was really to give us some baseline information so our health department could have a sense of where there might be a need to address issues related to climate change be it virus' coming into the area or whatever but I have always viewed this as there is an unknown and this would give us some money and resources to start looking at what we might expect and then provide some groundwork for developing a plan to address those issues. I do agree with Alderman Siegel, when I got this document I read the purpose of the grant initiative and had to reread it several times. In my mind though, very clearly, I think the final product results summary is what kind of wraps up where this is going and why it would be of importance to the city.

Alderman Cookson

Two quick points, one is that I am looking at the information that was provided, as a result of not having it at the last meeting, it's unfortunate that we didn't have more information but now that we have it I just have a few questions. I am looking at the table on the second page, it goes through several different outcomes, specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound and I just want to verify that for the third row, increased access to information regarding the priority, climate and health impact in the region that the time bound is actually that this will occur in the summer of 2012? I am assuming not. Lastly there is a comment

in the last row that says improve the municipal capacity to understand and address the priority climate and health impact. Through all of this conversation it's talking about sub-contracting it out to NRPC. NRPC is the group that will be conducting and facilitating this for us so we are accepting a grant for \$40,000; the City of Nashua. I am assuming that we are just going to hand over the \$40,000 to NRPC so they can do this because of the sub-contracting and yet all thirteen municipalities in the region will receive the materials of which we have accepted this \$40,000 grant. My question is what other municipalities are contributing to this grant and not just the City of Nashua?

President McCarthy

I can't answer that other than to say that it's a grant and I believe that NRPC had one of the member communities; probably Nashua because our name was on the title apply for it. We applied for it and the state gave to us to benefit all the other communities.

Alderman Cookson

So, not just Nashua but all thirteen municipalities that are part of NRPC?

President McCarthy

That would be my assumption.

Alderman Siegel

There were certain comments that were made off-line; not by any of my colleagues here but that somehow this had something to do with climate change denial or any nonsense like that. My objections have zero to do with that and I want to make that publicly clear. I would also like to thank my colleague, Alderman Cookson, for pointing out that this table is rather amusing in that it appears to have been cut and pasted and basically reused. I understand that there is a lot of motivation to do that kind of stuff but it doesn't exactly inspire a lot of confidence about the amount of vetting that actually went into that.

Alderman Moriarty

Is the motion currently to reconsider and if it passes do we then have to vote to pass it?

President McCarthy

Yes.

Alderman Moriarty

Is this motion to reconsider procedural and therefore non-debatable?

President McCarthy

It's generally debatable as to the merits of reconsideration. We tend to me a little bit more lax with the rules about the debate of that motion. I wanted to comment that I got the information that was sent to us from the Department of Health and frankly, I'm not sure where I stand on the substance of the matter itself even after reading it. I am concerned with the way this resolution was handled at the previous meeting and the fact that we voted on something that the way we did. As Alderman Moriarty read to you before rule #1 says that the purpose of the rules is to expose in advance the will of the majority of the body. The motion to pass failed 7 to 6 with two sponsors who we can reasonably assume supported the bill were not there. What I would assume from that is that the will of the majority was a majority wanted to pass it. We didn't

use the rules to serve that purpose which is what they are there for and that is my whole concern with the way this piece of legislation was handled. As I understand it, it is a pass through grant at NRPC. I don't know for sure that I think it's valuable but I tend to defer on grants to the wisdom of the Human Affairs Committee because that's the purpose of that committee. What concerns me are the rules and frankly I agree absolutely with Alderman Siegel. I spoke with Alderman Clemons and in fact urged him not to make the motion prior to this meeting just because of the way it would turn out. I think we need to go back to using the rules to work together and not to see how we can nefariously get our way around the majority of the Board, if that's what is happening. I'm not saying that anyone has done anything nefarious, I am saying that it would have been a good idea at the previous meeting to defer it to the motion to table and take the vote when 15 people are here and can state their positions on it and have their votes count. What I would ask the Board to do at this point is to, given the discussion that we have had, is to reconsider it and send it back to the Human Affairs Committee. Let's get some real information on it. It may turn out that we don't want it but there are still some unanswered questions as near as I could tell and we ought to have those answers before we do anything with it. I would ask that the Board reconsider it and return it to the Human Affairs Committee for further study.

Alderman Deane

I would like to know what the prepared motions were for this piece of legislation that Alderman Clemons has in front of him.

President McCarthy

I am not sure I know what you mean.

Alderman Deane

The motions are prepared for him prior to the meeting.

President McCarthy

Correct.

Alderman Deane

I'd like to know if there is a motion there to re-refer it to the Human Affairs Committee or not.

President McCarthy

No, there is not. That's my opinion and my opinion only. Alderman Clemons had said that he wanted to make a motion to reconsider it. I told him and I told the legislation assistant that the proper motions were a motion to allow reconsideration by a party not on the prevailing side and if that passed then a motion to reconsider. Does that answer your question, Alderman Deane?

Alderman Deane

Thank you.

Alderman Clemons

I also did send out a communication via e-mail to the entire Board telling everyone that I intended to do this at this meeting.

Alderman Cookson

What wasn't done was that the public was not made aware that this would be brought up for reconsideration this evening with the opportunity for them to sign up for public comment for items to be acted upon this evening and they were not given the opportunity. At some point in time, somebody should have made that known to the public.

President McCarthy

That is true and thank you for pointing that out. Are there any other comments on the motion to reconsider? There were none.

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Dowd, 8  
Alderman Caron, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman O'Brien,  
Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: Alderman Deane, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Siegel,  
Alderman Schoneman, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,  
Alderman Moriarty 7

**MOTION CARRIED**

**R-16-007**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$40,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES INTO PUBLIC HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GRANT ACTIVITY "FY2016 AND FY2017 CLIMATE AND HEALTH ADAPTATION PLAN (CHAP)"**

Given its third reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-007**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN COOKSON TO RE-REFER TO THE HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, 13  
Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman,  
Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun,  
Alderman Moriarty, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez,  
Alderman McCarthy

Nay: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane 2

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-007 re-referred to the Human Affairs Committee.

**R-16-008**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderswoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

**ADDING FOUR ADDITIONAL PARCELS TO THE "SPIT BROOK ROAD ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION ZONE"**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERSWOMAN MELIZZI-GOLJA FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-16-008**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Moriarty

I just want to note that it was not a unanimous vote to recommend final passage.

Alderman Siegel

I read the minutes from that meeting and I felt like I left economic earth at one point. I was happy that a majority voted for that. I can't understand why we would vote against something like that. I think if it were up to me I would make all of Nashua have a lower BPT and BET; it's the biggest job killer that New Hampshire has so congratulations; we should do everything in our power to get 300 manufacturing jobs into Nashua. It would be insane to vote against this.

Alderman Moriarty

With that introduction I'll comment on a couple of things. Keeping taxes low in order to make New Hampshire competitive with the nation; there's nobody on this Board that can hold that mantle other than me as far as a champion of keeping spending under control and taxes low and trying not to run the seniors out of the city. I've been talking about reducing the BPT and BET for years. I absolutely 100% agree. I like the idea of the term "revitalization," the economic revitalization zone, something like a blighted area. The issue that I have has to do with corporate welfare, the type of thing that citizens across the nation have lost faith in Congress because of special favors and the tax codes that gives breaks to favored interests. It's a non-uniform application of the law. The reason why we can't balance our budget is because you have subsidies of this organization and subsidiaries of that and this congressional district subsidizes that. What happens is the general population gets stuck footing the bill. If we want to reduce the BET and the BPT all across New Hampshire uniformly I am all for it and I've been saying that forever. The problem is when you give special favors and in this particular case the ordinance is requesting that we add four properties to this economic revitalization zone in south Nashua. The four properties are BAE Systems. If we give a tax break to BAE then that's not revitalizing anything, it's one of the most mature companies in the State of New Hampshire, it's been here for fifty years, it's healthy, it's not going anywhere and it is here to stay. This bill does not revitalize anything. You say you want to revitalize Spit Brook Road? Spit Brook Road does not need revitalization, it's doing just fine thank you. This particular property area is the most expensive real estate in all of New Hampshire; it's the complete opposite of revitalization. Regarding giving the special favor, the tax break to BAE in order for them to create jobs is also not true. They have already paid for these jobs. They eliminated 70 – 74 high paying senior people last September. Giving them a tax break isn't going to encourage them to hire more people, it's already in the plan and we are rewarding an organization for axing 74 loyal people who had been working for the company for 10, 15, or 20 years. There is a legitimate reason to vote against this. I wasn't going to mention all of that because I think we are stuck on roll call with this and I didn't want to put my colleagues on the spot by making them back me. It's corporate welfare for an organization that has not treated their employees well recently. They kept it under the minimum; if you lay off 75 people you have to give a press release so they only laid off 73 people and didn't have to make the press release. Just to show good faith I am going to abstain from this one.

Alderman Siegel

If you want to recuse yourself you normally do that before the discussion but just for everybody's education as someone that is actually an entrepreneur that starts businesses in New Hampshire let me give you a little education about the BPT. The Business Profit Tax is the one biggest joke every because in order to avoid it which is fairly simple you just run your business so you don't have profits which unfortunately has the side effect of making it very difficult to get capital from commercial banks because they see no matter what the cash flow into all the companies pockets that the people who own the company or have shares in the company, it doesn't matter because they are not showing a profit. The other way to get around that is to just be a LLC. which happens all of the time. Here we have an established corporation trying to have 300 manufacturing jobs and we are going to tell them you know what, you are not located in the Millyard so we can't help you, in which case they will say, that's great maybe we will go to Merrimack. I'm beside myself that this is even an issue because this will help Nashua tremendously.

Alderman Dowd

I will also be recusing myself as I am still an employee of BAE but in fairness to the previous comments, I totally disagree with Alderman Moriarty.

President McCarthy

Since we seem to be sticklers for the rules this evening, I would point out that our rules, by ordinance, declare that unless you have a stated conflict of interest under the terms of the ordinances which involve employers or employers of relatives you must vote. Alderman Moriarty, would you point out what the conflict is that precludes you from voting?

Alderman Moriarty

If you are going to insist that I vote then I will vote but in defense of Alderman Dowd he can actually get in trouble at work if he votes for this so you should grant him so leniency.

President McCarthy

I believe that he has a legitimate statement of conflict.

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

|          |   |    |
|----------|---|----|
| Yea:     | Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane,<br>Alderman Cookson, Alderman Caron, Alderman Siegel,<br>Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja, Alderman McGuinness,<br>Alderman LeBrun, Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez,<br>Alderman McCarthy | 13 |
| Nay:     | Alderman Moriarty   | 1  |
| Abstain: | Alderman Dowd   | 1  |

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-16-008 declared duly adopted.



UNFINISHED BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

**O-16-005**

Endorser: Alderman David Schoneman

**REMOVING THREE PARKING SPACES ON LOWELL STREET FROM THE PERMITTED  
OVERNIGHT ON-STREET PARKING PROGRAM**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SCHONEMAN FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF O-16-005**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, 15  
Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron,  
Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja,  
Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty,  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Lopez, Alderman McCarthy

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

Ordinance O-16-005 declared duly adopted.

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-16-014**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**CHANGING THE PURPOSE OF UP TO \$600,000 OF UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS  
FROM THE BROAD STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT, \$159,815  
OF UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS FROM THE SCHOOL ROOF REPLACEMENTS  
PROJECT AND \$228,956.44 OF UNEXPENDED SCHOOL CAPITAL RESERVE FUND  
APPROPRIATIONS FROM THE HIGH SCHOOLS' GYM FLOORS PROJECT TO THE  
SUNSET HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HVAC IMPROVEMENTS AND BUILDING  
RENOVATIONS PROJECT**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-015**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**ESTABLISHING AN EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND FOR STATE EMPLOYER PENSION COSTS  
AND APPROPRIATING \$2,230,000 FROM FUND BALANCE ASSIGNED FOR THIS PURPOSE  
INTO THE EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-016**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF NASHUA TO ENTER INTO A FIRST AMENDMENT TO LEASE AGREEMENT WITH MAKEIT LABS FOR A PORTION OF 25 CROWN STREET**

Given its first reading; assigned to the FINANCE COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-017**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$70,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES INTO PUBLIC HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GRANT ACTIVITIES "FY17 AND FY18 TUBERCULOSIS PROGRAM OF GREATER NASHUA"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-018**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Don LeBrun  
Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$120,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES INTO PUBLIC HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GRANT ACTIVITIES "FY17 AND FY18 IMMUNIZATION PROGRAM OF GREATER NASHUA"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

**R-16-019**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Don LeBrun  
Alderman Tom Lopez

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$170,000 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES INTO PUBLIC HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES GRANT ACTIVITIES "FY17 AND FY18 STD & HIV DISEASE CONTROL"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President McCarthy

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

**O-16-006**

Endorsers: Alderman Ken Siegel  
Alderdwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**AUTHORIZING A STOP SIGN ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF HOLLYHOCK AVENUE  
AT ITS INTERSECTION WITH CHERRYWOOD DRIVE**

Given its first reading; assigned to the COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE by President McCarthy

PERIOD FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Mary Elizabeth Carroll, 91 ½ Chandler Street

I was last here in January. I'm very sick right now; I almost went into cardiac arrest because my clothes were loaded with a chemical that looks and feels like glass. After having Christmas with my mother I saw a bed bug on my bedroom wall and I went to the Marblehead Board of Health and gave them some information about the environment and they told me to go to a dermatologist. I saw the dermatologist on February 29<sup>th</sup> and in between I've been into three houses and infected them. I went to Heidi's building on Monday after I saw the dermatologist; Heidi Peek is the environmental health lady and she doesn't care. I told her that I was on fire and was contagious. She said "you think you are highly contagious." So I said okay I'll go to your building until one of you gets sick. She said she didn't want to see me every day as that was negative attention so I went to her building on Tuesday and I stayed in the hallway. It was a little contaminated. I went back on Wednesday and it was really contaminated. Thursday I saw my case manager at Community Council and he said Heidi had called him and left a message with an intake worker telling her that I am on fire. She should be calling poison control and not Community Council. My anger issues with Heidi may be a psychiatric issue but the poison in my body is Heidi Peek's issue. Yesterday I saw glass pouring out of both of my hands. Heidi is useless and she doesn't care. I am trying to find a dermatologist to do a biopsy but there's nothing on me and according to the doctors if it's not on you then it's not in you. Like I said to the Mayor last year the beaches are connected to the ocean and the ocean is connected to the whole world. I am going on all of Facebook and all of Twitter tomorrow because I can't find a doctor. I guess I am going to infect every building until the whole building gets sick. I'll just keep infecting Heidi's building until someone gets sick. It's not right that someone has to get sick to prove I'm sick but if that's the way Heidi Peek wants it.

Mr. Bernie Cote, 22 Granley Street

I don't know if this is the proper place to bring this up but this is about a crosswalk on Main Street where that Santander Bank is. Well, I was heading toward the Bank of America and I was trying to cross and the cars wouldn't stop. Number one, the crosswalk needs to be repainted and you need to put a sign there marked "crosswalk/pedestrian's walking." Someday someone is going to get run over.

REMARKS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN

Alderman Lopez

I'd like to thank the previous speaker for making that comment. I think any citizens who spot dangerous areas in the city should give the feedback back to the city. I also wanted to remark on the debate we had regarding the grant for the Public Health Department. I think Alderman Siegel raised a value point about making sure that we do research before endorsing pieces of legislation. I took that to heart and I want to apologize to the Board for not having the answers that I should have had as the liaison to the Board of Health. I'll do my best to do better in the future. I also wanted to make an announcement that this Saturday at 11:00 a.m. there is an awareness walk to raise awareness of the impact of the opioid crisis. I

encourage all of the Board of Aldermen to attend. It really puts a human face on the numbers and statistics that we may be seeing and the need for the resources that we are custodians of.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Several of you got e-mails or texts from me regarding use of the microphone last night, especially the use of the public microphone; it was not well situated for many of the speakers to be caught. I think if you are running a meeting to make sure it's all captured appropriately.

Alderman Schoneman

I think the issue last night was that the people weren't speaking into it.

Alderman Siegel

I'd like to thank Mr. Cote for coming up, hopefully that's something we can take a look at. Regarding the meeting last night I think part of the problem was that it was just general mayhem. There was a period of time during public comment where it was just a lot of yelling when it should have been more orderly. It wasn't supposed to be an on-going debate about legislation that had already been voted on. I would like to not have to go through that again as it wasn't a pleasant experience.

Alderman Cookson

I wanted to make reference to R-16-014 which was regarding changing the purposed of up to \$600,000 of unexpended bond proceeds from the Broad Street School Elementary project. I want you to know and I am seeking guidance on this particular topic; I received a call from a constituent in Ward 1 who was concerned about the darkness of the intersection of Broad Street and Upstone. Surprisingly the construction that took place to remove the wooded area to increase the parking has actually made the intersection darker as you are travelling westbound towards Hollis. You don't see your headlights reflect on the brush or the trees so it's very difficult to see. With that being said I don't know what the solution is. There is a pole that's directly across the street but it doesn't have cobra headlight on it. Do you request the electric company to install a cobra? Do we do that through infrastructure or is there an opportunity with some of the \$600,000 that are pulling away from the school to actually look at that intersection to make a lighted improvement so you can see the intersection at Upstone?

President McCarthy

It isn't something we generally do out of the bond proceeds. It would be done through the Infrastructure Committee via a communication asking them to install a light on that pole and why.

Alderman Cookson

If that light is not enough? That's my concern.

President McCarthy

Then we would have to look at it some more. That might be a good place to try out some of the new fixtures when we get around to it. Those lights are not tremendously expensive if I recall and it should be paid for out of the streetlight account which should have enough money to cover it.

Alderman Cookson

The practice throughout the city is that we alternate lights; one on and one off and in this case you would have three consecutive lights lit and I'm not sure if that's a big deal or not.

President McCarthy

We typically go off script when it comes to streetlights.

Alderman Dowd

After reading the minutes of the Infrastructure meeting, I went through that intersection at night. I think with the new LED lights that those two lights would be intense enough for that intersection. If you put in three LED's you might have neighbors complaining about it being too light.

Alderman Clemons

Regarding the Personnel & Administrative Affairs Committee meeting last night, I will take responsibility for the public not being able to hear. We had a very heated crowd there who were not in favor of the legislation that we had passed. There was some confusion and even Alderman LeBrun received an e-mail yesterday that the meeting had been cancelled. To compound that problem we had moved the meeting to an earlier time to facilitate a heavy schedule. I suppose the discussion could have been handled more appropriately however I do believe that the public needs to speak at the committee meetings and ask questions of us as well. As far as that practice goes I won't be changing that.

Alderman Wilshire

I wanted to thank the Mayor for the two excellent appointments he brought forward tonight and the Board for confirming both. I have high respect for both individuals who were confirmed tonight. I also wanted to thank Mr. Cote for bringing those concerns to the Board.

***Inaudible from a member of the audience.***

Committee announcements:

Chairman Wilshire

Human Affairs is on March 14<sup>th</sup> here in the Chamber.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Planning and Economic Development Committee is on March 15<sup>th</sup> here in the Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN WILSHIRE THAT THE MARCH 8, 2016, MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED**

*A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

Yea: Alderman Wilshire, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Deane, 14  
Alderman Cookson, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Caron,  
Alderman Siegel, Alderman Schoneman, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja,  
Alderman McGuinness, Alderman LeBrun, Alderman Moriarty,  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderman McCarthy

**MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Attest: Patricia D. Piecuch, City Clerk